

Application No. 09/897,221  
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner's allowance of claims 9-16 and the Examiner's indication of the allowability of the subject matter of claims 3-6 are respectfully acknowledged.

Claims 3-6, however, have not been rewritten in independent form at this time since, as set forth in detail hereinbelow, it is respectfully submitted that their parent claim 1, as amended, also recites allowable subject matter.

THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claims 1, 8 and 17 have been amended to clarify the feature of the present invention whereby the plurality of candidates are candidates for clipping (i.e., candidates for the mode of clipping), as supported by the disclosure in the specification at, for example, page 17, lines 8-12 and Fig. 1 Ref. No. 103.

In addition, claims 18-22 have been added to recite features supported by the disclosure in the specification at, for example, page 17, line 25 through page 18, line 1 and Fig. 1 Ref. No. 107.

Application No. 09/897,221  
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered.

CLAIM FEE

The application was originally filed with 17 claims of which 5 were independent, and the appropriate claim fee was paid for such claims. The application now contains 22 claims, of which 5 are independent. Accordingly, a claim fee in the amount of \$100.00 for the addition of 2 extra claims in excess of twenty is attached hereto. In addition, authorization is hereby given to charge any additional fees which may be determined to be required to Account No. 06-1378.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1-8 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of USP 5,754,676 ("Komiya et al") and USP 5,144,683 ("Suzuki et al"). This rejection, however, is respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as amended herein above.

According to the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 8 and 17, a learning type image classification apparatus and method are provided for classifying a plurality of images. As recited in the amended claims, the

Application No. 09/897,221  
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

apparatus and method select a mode of clipping a region from an image out of a plurality of candidates for the mode of clipping, and then clip the region from the image in the selected mode.

By contrast, although Komiya et al does disclose an image classification device comprising a learning function whereby a feature is extracted from an image and a plurality of images are classified using the feature, Komiya et al does not disclose a region clipping mode selection section which selects a selectable clipping mode out of a plurality of candidates for a clipping mode to clip a region from an image.

Suzuki et al, moreover, merely discloses character recognition equipment which processes an image in a plurality of image regions set in a character image, and then carries out character recognition. Figs. 16, 17 and 19 of Suzuki, for example, are flow diagrams of character recognition showing the sequence in an automatic mode, a semiautomatic mode, and a manual mode, respectively. However, it is respectfully submitted that Suzuki et al does not disclose a difference between the character recognition processes (162, 178, 192) in the automatic mode, the semiautomatic mode and the manual mode, respectively. And in Suzuki et al, the entire character recognition process, the verification process of the recognition result, and the display of the recognition result are different in each mode. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Suzuki et al does not disclose

Application No. 09/897,221  
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

teach or suggest a mode for clipping a region of an image and a candidate for a region clipping mode.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that neither Komiya et al nor Suzuki et al discloses, teaches, or suggests selecting a mode of clipping a region from an image out of a plurality of candidates for the mode of clipping, and then clipping the region from the image in the selected mode, as according to the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 8 and 17.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 8 and 17, as well as all of the claims respectively depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguish over Komiya et al and Suzuki et al under 35 USC 103 taken singly or in any combination.

\* \* \* \* \*

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

Application No. 09/897,221  
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz  
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
767 Third Avenue - 25th Floor  
New York, New York 10017-2023  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:db  
encs.